DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 874 HE 005 901

AUTHOR Stecklein, John E.
TITLE How to Measure Faculty Work Load.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 61
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Higher Education; *Measurement; *Measurement Techniques; *Teaching Load; Working Hours

ABSTRACT

This document investigates the measurement of faculty workload. Emphasis is placed on the uses and values of faculty workload studies, various methods of measuring faculty workload, including measures based on course inventories and faculty reports, recommended procedures for making a comprehensive faculty load analysis, and uses of faculty load data. Recommended procedures for making a comprehensive faculty load analysis include the formation of a faculty advisory committee; determination of guiding policies; development of report forms; content of faculty activities report; distribution and collection of forms; and tabulation, analysis, and reporting of results. (MJM)

67-

LIBRARY
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

ED 096874

HOW TO MEASURE FACULTY WORK LOAD

By JOHN E. STECKLEIN, Director
Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota

Prepared for the
OFFICE OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION AND RESEARCH
OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American Council on Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

HE 005 901

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION • *Washington, D.C.*

© 1961 BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NO. 61-13705

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Committee on Statistical Information and Research

Appointed by the American Council on Education

Frederick L. Hovde, PRESIDENT, PURDUE UNIVERSITY; *Chairman*

Robert D. Calkins, PRESIDENT, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

Harold C. Case, PRESIDENT, BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Ruth E. Eckert, PROFESSOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Paul S. Reinert, S.J., PRESIDENT, SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Richard H. Sullivan, PRESIDENT, REED COLLEGE

Dael Wolfle, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Arthur S. Adams, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, *ex officio*

Elmer D. West, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION AND RESEARCH

Foreword

THE INCREASING PRESSURES ON HIGHER EDUCATION—THE NEED FOR more faculty, facilities, and funds to provide for more students—have resulted in an intensification of concern for the effective use of faculty talent and time. Various conferences held under the auspices of the American Council on Education attest to the Council's long interest in this problem. Other organizations and institutions, as well as an increasing number of individuals, have also shown interest. In November 1959, the Council's Office of Statistical Information and Research in cooperation with the three regional associations (New England Board of Higher Education, Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) sponsored a conference at Purdue University on problems relating to faculty work load. The attendance at this conference and the acceptance given the report of the proceedings (Bunnell, *Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report*, American Council on Education, 1960) gave additional evidence of the widening interest in the problems relating to faculty work loads.

However, statements on definitions and methodologies applicable in the measurement of faculty work load were not readily available, and the necessity for additional clarification of possible procedures became apparent. The Council's Office of Statistical Information and Research was fortunate in securing the services of Professor John E. Stecklein, director of institutional research, University of Minnesota, for the preparation of this brochure. Dr. Stecklein has developed the issues in a practical way and has suggested alternative methods of procedure.

Both his cautions and his suggestions on procedure should prove helpful to all those concerned with the issues with which he deals.

ARTHUR S. ADAMS, *President*
American Council on Education

N1

Contents

Foreword *Arthur S. Adams* v

List of Tables and Figures ix

1. Uses and Values of Faculty Work Load Studies 1

2. Various Methods of Measuring Faculty Work Load 3

   MEASURES BASED ON COURSE INVENTORIES 4

   MEASURES BASED ON FACULTY REPORTS 6

3. Recommended Procedures for Making a Comprehensive Faculty Load Analysis 8

   FORMATION OF A FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE 8

   DETERMINATION OF GUIDING POLICIES 9

   DEVELOPMENT OF REPORT FORMS 11

   CONTENT OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT 18

   DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF FORMS 24

   TABULATION, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING OF RESULTS 26

4. Uses of Faculty Load Data 35

List of Tables

1. Summary of Mean Percents of Time Spent by Faculty Members on Teaching Activities, by Type and Level of Instruction and by Rank, for Three Selected Colleges, Academic Year 1954–55 27
2. Number and Percent of Full-time Academic Staff Members in "College A" Devoting Specified Proportions of Time to Various Functions, by Rank 28
3. Percentages of Faculty Spending Selected Proportions of Time on Teaching, Research, and Services in Three Colleges, by Rank 30
4. Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching Activities per Clock-Hour of Instruction in "College A," by Rank and Level of Instruction, Fall Quarter, 1954 31
5. Average Hours per Week Devoted by Faculty in "College A" to Selected Activities, by Rank, 1950–51 31
6. Percent of Time Spent per Instructor Clock-Hour and per 10 Student Clock-Hours by Faculties of Selected Departments, by Rank and Course Level, "College A" 32

List of Figures

1. Form Used To Obtain Faculty Data in Kansas Study of Higher Education 39
2. Form Used To Obtain Faculty Data in California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study 50

1. Uses and Values of Faculty Work Load Studies

VERY FEW BUSINESSES OR INSTITUTIONS OF COMPARABLE SIZE, complexity, and diversity of function operate with as little detailed knowledge and understanding of the basic activities of their workers as do most colleges and universities. Even in colleges where size is not a factor, little is usually known about faculty activities over and above the assigned classroom meetings with students and a few committee assignments. In some very small institutions, the college president or dean may be so familiar with each faculty member's work that he has a fairly complete picture of total faculty activities. But in too many institutions little has been done to collect systematically information concerning the total faculty work load.

Studies of faculty load provide vital information which can be used to improve an institution in many ways. Current faculty utilization must be thoroughly understood if an institution expects to adjust to conditions caused by the rising shortage of qualified faculty members. Knowledge of faculty functions is important not only in reorganizing educational programs to serve new objectives, but in assessing the effect of such changes upon faculty activities and needs. The development and use of new tools or methods of instruction, such as teaching machines and television, changes to some extent the concept of the college teacher's work role. Similarly, an increase in independent student study and other devices to increase student responsibility in the learning process will affect faculty work patterns. In short, a good understanding of faculty work activities is essential to the efficient operation of a college or university, and important in assessing the effect of new elements and changes in higher education.

It would seem appropriate to comment at this point that the faculty load study process has immediate and direct value long before any

data have been analyzed. It requires the individual staff member to take stock and think out how he spent his time during the terms being studied. Many faculty members have never stopped to determine exactly where their time goes and have no over-all perspective concerning the use of their time. The collection of faculty load data may result in changes made by the faculty members themselves, without administrative suggestion. Such aids are extremely important to a group as reliant upon self-evaluation as are our college and university academic staffs.

In practice, faculty load studies may evolve in a number of ways. The president of an institution may want detailed information concerning the activities and services of his faculty to document a request to his board of trustees or to the legislature for salary increases. A department chairman or a dean of a college may want information concerning faculty activities as a supplemental basis for comparing requests for additional staff or new budget allocations from units under his jurisdiction. A study by a faculty committee may be prompted by the feeling that certain faculty activities are not receiving proper recognition by department heads or other administrators. Another committee representing the faculty of an institution, college, or department may seek detailed information about faculty activities to provide a framework within which to reappraise the functions served by the unit. Administrators may be concerned about instructional costs and need accurate faculty load data to determine such costs.

2. Various Methods of Measuring Faculty Work Load

THE ATTEMPTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE TO STUDY FACULTY WORK load have usually reported loads in terms of the number of credit hours, class hours, student credit hours, or student class hours taught per semester or quarter of the academic year—generally because such information is readily available in the registrar's or dean's office.[1] For more than twenty years experts have protested that such work analyses are incomplete and present a distorted picture of faculty duties. Some, in fact, attribute the popular misconception of the teacher as a person who has only a 15-hour work week to such practices.

Naturally, when a study of faculty activities is extended beyond assigned classroom instruction, the problem of measurement or evaluation becomes far more complex. Measures of such activities as administration, research, public and professional services, and counseling have not been consistently categorized or defined, and many problems arise when an attempt is made to measure the extent of faculty participation in such activities. Similarly, although the credit hour, class hour, student credit hour, or student class hour have, over the years, become rather uniformly accepted and understood in academic circles as measures of the teaching load, even an instructional analysis becomes much more complicated and difficult if it is extended to include the amount of time spent on related activities, such as preparation for class, conferences with students, composing tests, grading tests and term papers, or editing theses. These latter activities are all essential aspects of most classroom instruction, and yet most institutions know

[1] W. Hugh Stickler, "Working Material and Bibliography on Faculty Load," in *Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report*, ed. Kevin Bunnell (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960), pp. 80–97.

very little about the relationship of time spent on such activities to time spent in the classroom. The traditional idea that two hours outside the classroom are spent for each hour of classroom instruction has a most uncertain ancestry, and appears to be especially open to question when it is taken as a standard for nearly all faculty, regardless of rank and levels and subjects taught.

Some people oppose the idea of faculty load measurement because they believe that it is impossible to categorize the various faculty activities into mutually exclusive classes. While it may be true that discrete classification is very difficult, and perhaps impossible, the problems are no more difficult than those encountered by business and industry when they allocate costs of administration, supervision, and design. Others argue that it is not possible for a faculty member to recall exactly what he has done during a certain period of time, or to allocate his time accurately among the various activities that he does each day. Evidence suggests, however, that man's ability to estimate time spent is amazingly well developed and will probably improve with practice.

Measures Based on Course Inventories

Nearly every college and university lists, for internal use, all courses taught each quarter or each semester of the academic year, and tallies the names of the instructors, the credits offered, the size and type of classes, and the number of hours that the classes meet per week. These basic tabulations are a ready source of information for faculty load studies which concentrate only on the instructional functions of the faculty. Such data can be used to determine the total number of credit hours, class or contact hours, students, student credit hours, or student class hours taught by each faculty member, analyzed by rank groups or by subject-field groups. These types of faculty load measures, however, are based upon faculty assignments and do not get down to the basic element of faculty work loads—the actual amount of time that each faculty member spends doing what he has been assigned to do—or to consideration of the many duties which faculty members voluntarily assume.

Common sense suggests that the time involved in teaching a 3-credit course in freshman mathematics may be quite different from the time

required to teach a 3-credit sophomore course in English, a 3-credit junior course in physics, or a 3-credit senior course in sociology. Although department heads customarily attempt to adjust faculty instructional assignments to take into account extra-large enrollments, multiple sections, or differences in levels of courses taught, such adjustments are almost never made on the basis of factual knowledge regarding differences in time requirements for teaching different subjects, at different levels, and by different individuals. Faculty loads have not been studied enough to give us a thorough understanding, based upon repeated measurement under the same and different conditions, of what determines differences among subject fields and among levels of instruction and of how great these differences can be expected to be under a certain set of circumstances.

Some institutions have attempted to augment the central instructional load study by collecting from the individual faculty members data concerning the amount of time spent on the various aspects of instruction—course preparation, paper grading, student tutoring, and student evaluation. Such information makes it possible to study the relationships between credit-hour or class-hour loads and the amount of time spent by faculty members in the various ranks as well as by faculty in different subject fields. At one institution, for example, exploratory comparisons showed that full professors spent a larger proportion of their time for each credit hour of lower division instruction than did the associate professors. Similarly, in comparing teaching loads in different subject fields, analyses showed that assistant professors in the Romance languages spent more than three times as much time per student clock hour of upper division instruction than did assistant professors in physics or mathematics.[2] Additional studies are needed to determine whether such differences fluctuate widely or are relatively stable from year to year.

Although such data provide a valuable addition to the understanding of instructional loads, they do not answer the complaint that the instructional work load constitutes only part of the total faculty load. Still missing is evidence concerning the extent to which each faculty member has assisted in the operation and administration of his department, his college, or his university. Similarly lacking is informa-

[2] Unpublished studies, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota.

tion concerning the extent to which each faculty member has been called upon by community groups or professional organizations for his services. And notably lacking, particularly in the multifunctional institutions, are measures suggesting the extent to which each faculty member has attempted to advance his particular field of knowledge through research. Faculty members also frequently participate in the operation of dormitories, cafeterias, physical plant, library, or various student services, and these too, are not accounted for in a faculty load study that concentrates only on instructional duties.

Measures Based on Faculty Reports

Unless one resorts to the "efficiency expert" approach of having an observer accompany a faculty member as he performs his various duties, it is necessary to use some type of report or survey form to collect information about the various activities that faculty members perform. Many institutions routinely request faculty members to report their publications, offices held in professional organizations, and other honors or public services rendered during the year. Although such information is invaluable in understanding what college faculty members do, it can be interpreted better if time allocation data are also available. As one method of providing both kinds of information, faculty members are sometimes asked to keep diaries of their activities for a week or two as a basis for answering report forms. Other times, faculty are simply asked to estimate their time, in terms of number of hours per week, per semester, or per quarter spent on various activities, or are asked to indicate on a percentage basis how their total activity was distributed among various activities. Any of these techniques provide considerably more detailed information concerning faculty performance than do lists or course inventory data.

Data collected in a more comprehensive approach enables an administrator to compare individuals within departments, or within colleges, on research activity, extent of involvement in administration and committee activity, amount of counseling and other student services, and demand for public services, and provides basic information about the activity that consumes the bulk of the faculty member's time—his instructional load. In other words, all of the information that can be collected in the simpler study described above can be

obtained, plus much more valuable and worthwhile data. For this reason, the remainder of this monograph will suggest procedures to be followed in making a comprehensive study of faculty load.[3]

[3] It should be pointed out that any meaningful faculty load study involving the amount of faculty time spent on activities is practically impossible in an institution where a standard load has been established. For example, if a college has established a 44-hour work week as standard, composed of 36 hours for instruction (12 credit hours plus 2 hours of outside preparation and related activity for each credit hour of class activity) and the remaining 8 hours for committee or student activities, it is almost impossible to get faculty members to indicate, either in terms of hours or percentages, any other distribution of time. If it is officially recognized that 36/44 of a man's time is to be spent on instruction, it will be the very unusual faculty member who will report a smaller proportion of his time devoted to that activity. In such a situation one might obtain accurate reports of individuals who worked more than 44 hours per week, or who spent more than 36 hours per week on instruction, but few individuals will admit they are "substandard" by reporting less than 36 hours on instruction or less than 44 hours for his average work week. On the other hand, in institutions where no average or standard work load has been established, there would appear to be less compunction on the part of staff members in reporting low or high numbers of hours of work activity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Recommended Procedures for Making a Comprehensive Faculty Load Analysis

WHATEVER THE PURPOSE OF A FACULTY LOAD STUDY, ITS USEFULNESS will be limited by the accuracy, completeness, and representativeness of the data collected. If the data cannot be relied upon, conclusions cannot be drawn with confidence. Procedures which have been found helpful in gathering reliable data about faculty activities are discussed in the following sections.

Formation of a Faculty Advisory Committee

Because it is so essential that the data collected represent each faculty member's best estimates of his activities, the need for faculty cooperation cannot be overstressed. If the faculty members are not convinced that the load study is for their best interests as well as for the good of the institution, they are not likely to complete data forms conscientiously and carefully. The need for strong faculty cooperation and interest in a faculty load study suggests that if a central administrative officer wishes to make a faculty load study, he should enlist the cooperation of a strong faculty committee—perhaps the educational policies committee, or another leading committee of the faculty—convince the members of the value of the study, and solicit the committee's cosponsorship.

If the study is faculty-initiated, a faculty committee will probably be established to conduct it. To assist a faculty committee in making as effective a study as possible, funds should be made available to provide consultative and clerical help in the development and printing of forms, in the collection of data, and in the subsequent analysis of the data. At least, the chairman of the committee should be relieved of some of his regular instructional activities to devote ample

time to the study. If the study is initiated by an administrator, the advice of the faculty committee should be sought in setting up definitions and classifications, in the development of the questionnaire forms, and in the interpretation of findings. The committee will also be most helpful in endorsing the need for the study and requesting faculty cooperation for it.

If an institutional research office is given responsibility for the study, it, too, should work with a faculty advisory committee as described above. Besides providing expert advice on the design of report forms and analysis of data, the research office will supervise the processing, printing, distribution, and collection of questionnaire forms, and eliminate the need for special staff and released time for committee members.

Determination of Guiding Policies

Certain policies concerning the design and conduct of a research study should be set up at the outset. Most of such policies relate directly or indirectly to the purpose and scope of the study, but a few go beyond to cover special situations, personnel, or conditions.

Essential to any well-conceived faculty load study is a clear conception of its purpose. As study purposes vary, so will the nature of the forms used, the people involved, the kinds of information collected, the timing of the study, and the kinds of analyses of data. If the purpose is merely to identify the various kinds of activities performed by faculty members at one time or another, without concern about the amount of time devoted to such activities, a short, simple form might be adequate. If the underlying goal of the study is to improve the utilization of faculty, forms will have to be developed which will obtain information concerning time spent on the various activities, so that data will be available for comparative purposes, both within and among departments and colleges. If the basic purpose of the study is to gather information concerning costs, some provision must be made to enable the conversion of faculty time spent on various activities to dollar amounts representing the costs of that time.

Faculty and administrators should be equally informed about the purpose of the study, to avoid uncertainty and suspicion, and to encourage cooperation. They should be told how the data will be han-

dled, who will see them, and in some instances, how they will be used. If a continuing series of studies is planned, the faculty might be forewarned so that they may keep better records.

Thought must be given to whether the proposed load study is to be a "one-shot affair" or is to be the forerunner of a set of periodic studies of its kind. Although a single study is better than none, maximum benefits are derived if the study is repeated periodically. The elements that influence faculty load data are too complex to be fully understood after a single study, however complete and well designed it may be.

Implicit in any statement of purpose is the assumption that materials and information collected will be used in a professional manner, whether by faculty committees or by administrators. Data provided by faculty members will represent varying degrees of confidentiality that should be respected. Actions based upon interpretations of data should be taken cautiously until it is possible to check the reliability and validity of the data. This implies that the best use of faculty load data is in long-range study and planning—the identification of trends and groupings rather than a search for individual variations. Certainly to be avoided is the hard-to-resist tendency to develop a mechanical basis for establishing faculty load, salaries, promotions, or other administrative acts, based upon the statistical data collected. Faculty data might better be considered a clue to areas of operation that warrant further investigation than a solution to particular problems. The collection of statistical data concerning faculty activities cannot replace, and should be only intended to supplement and undergird, the qualitative judgments that are necessary in conducting an academic enterprise and in dealing considerately with academic personnel.

Even if it has been agreed that a comprehensive analysis of faculty load is to be made, it is necessary to determine precisely what the study will include. The comprehensive study has been defined as including *all* of the professional functions of a faculty member (as nearly as such a complex of overt and covert activities can be identified), as contrasted with simple analyses of his instructional duties. But still to be decided is how far to carry the analysis of faculty activities. How much descriptive detail should be obtained about each activity? Should side jobs for extra pay be included? The most fre-

quent practice has been to exclude from the study all activities that were performed by faculty members for extra remuneration. In other words, the analysis of faculty load has been restricted to those professional activities which were considered to be the regular duties of faculty members on appointment to the institution. Activities were considered to be regular duties if they were performed without extra remuneration, and as an academician, not as a citizen.

The recent increase in consultative demands and opportunities suggests, however, that a request for data on "extrainstitutional" activities should be an integral part of the report forms used in faculty load studies in the future. It is unlikely that information would be requested concerning the income from such activities, but data on amount of time spent or the kinds of such jobs could be appropriately sought. Such information should be kept separate from data on regular duties of the faculty, to permit separate analyses.

Development of Report Forms

Once the scope of the study has been determined, the next step is the development of a form which will give each faculty member adequate opportunity to describe what he does in his capacity as a member of the faculty. Several essential questions have to be answered early in the process of developing report forms for a faculty load study:

- Who is to be included in the study?
- What kinds of questions are to be answered by the collection of the faculty load data?
- How are the data from the report forms to be analyzed?
- Is information desired beyond actual faculty activities? For example, data concerning educational history or previous experience of the faculty members?
- How should each faculty member be asked to report his work load—in terms of hours per week, per quarter, or per semester, or in terms of the percentage of his total working time spent on each of the kinds of activities?
- When is the best time to distribute the faculty load study form?
- How long a form can a faculty member reasonably be expected to complete?

The reader will recognize that a faculty advisory committee will be indispensable in answering most of the questions listed above.

Forms used by other institutions in faculty load studies may or may not be adequate for a specific new study. The extent to which they are usable depends upon the similarities of institutional type and study purposes. Generally, other forms are most useful in providing ideas concerning format and the kinds of questions to be used; but for the best and most effective collection of data, an institution should develop its own form, using the experience of others to improve its data collection process.

The preceding sentences imply, then, that no one single set of answers can be given to the questions listed above; they will have to be determined by each institution in light of its particular purpose in studying faculty loads. It is possible, however, to suggest some answers for the seven questions listed above which are based on other studies and experience gained from working on faculty load measurement.

• *What staff members should be included?* Often not considered until too late is whether certain groups employed by the college should be included in the load study. This question should be considered early because the inclusion of certain groups necessitates the inclusion of special categories or special questions on the report form to accommodate those groups. For example, in many institutions members of the library staff do not teach. Should these individuals be included as part of a faculty load study? In other cases, faculty members serve part time supervising the operation of a dormitory or cafeteria. Should these individuals be included in the study? Should teaching assistants be included?

Some studies have included only those individuals who held academic appointments.[1] Eligibility for the academic payroll varies from institution to institution, however, and is not a usable criterion for every college. One group of schools, although interested in all faculty activities, was most concerned about instructional costs, and consequently included only those persons who taught at least one course,

[1] Ruth E. Eckert, "The University Faculty Load Study," in *Studies in Higher Education*, Biennial Report of the Committee on Educational Research, University of Minnesota, 1940–42 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943), pp. 1–31.

regardless of what payroll they were on.[2] In a truly comprehensive faculty load study, however, all academic staff—full- and part-time faculty members (including student assistants)—and all administrative personnel would probably be included. Civil service employees, staff members on special summer appointments, or staff paid on an hourly basis would generally not be included. The primary aim, of course, is to get as complete a picture as possible of the activities of those individuals considered to be the academic faculty of the institution.

• *What questions should the study answer?* The following are examples of questions that can be answered by faculty load data:

1. What is the total full-time equivalent staff devoted to instruction at each level—lower division, upper division, and graduate? To all instruction combined? To various types of instruction?

2. What is the total full-time equivalent staff devoted to research? To administration? To student counseling? To public and professional services?

3. What is the relationship between type of instruction and percentage of time devoted to such instruction? Between type of instruction and time spent on various phases of instruction?

4. How much extracurricular consultation and service are provided by faculty members for extra remuneration?

5. What is the average percentage of time spent by professors on each of the various levels of instruction? What is the average percentage of time spent by each of the other rank groups on each level of instruction?

6. What proportion of his time does the average professor (or other ranks) devote to public services? To research? To administrative duties? To student services?

7. How do the various departments or subject fields differ in faculty time spent upon certain functions?

8. What is the average number of hours in the work week for faculty members at each rank? In each subject field or department?

9. What is the full-time equivalent staff per student class hour? Per student credit hour?

[2] The report of this study was published under the title *California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Report* (New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1960). The form used to collect data for this study is reproduced in Fig. 2, on pp. 50–51, and is discussed later in this chapter.

10. What is the relationship between credit hour or class hour loads and percent or amount of time devoted to instruction at the various ranks?

The content of the report form, of course, will reflect the kinds of questions raised, both in terms of kinds and amounts of data requested.

• *How should the data be analyzed?* Consideration should be given early in planning the study to techniques that will be used in tabulating and analyzing the data. If the faculty is quite small, tabulation and classification of the responses by hand may be simpler than machine analysis. In cases where a large number of faculty members are involved, say 100 or more, it is generally advisable to plan the form so that the information reported can easily be transcribed to punch cards for processing by machine. Planning ahead for the machine tabulation will enable the designers of the report form to code the items in such a way that the transcription of the material can be easily accomplished. Information may be lost if the posing of questions is not closely related to the planning of methods of tabulation and analysis. Several kinds of analyses are suggested by the tables toward the end of this monograph.

• *What kind of report form should be used?* It is essential that each faculty member feel that the report form gives him ample opportunity to describe accurately the kinds of activities that he performed during the period under study. Planning such a form is difficult because the more provisions made for distinctive responses, the more difficult is the analysis and, usually, the longer the form. Some compromise has to be reached that will give each faculty member the opportunity to express adequately how he has spent his time and, at the same time, preserve the simplicity of data tabulation and analysis that is desirable.[3]

[3] Generally, a faculty load report form covering a year's activities need not exceed three or four 8½ × 11-inch pages, unless extra information is collected. This number of pages should be adequate to cover the basic activities that most faculty members perform and enable them to indicate clearly how they spent their time. If the form is limited to two pages or less, certain faculty activities may be neglected and the study will no longer be a comprehensive analysis of faculty load, or activities may be grouped together in such a way that the form will not adequately differentiate faculty functions. Likewise, analyses of data collected by such forms will not bring out the differences in faculty uses of time that should be one of the goals of a faculty load study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The variation in activities and services provided by faculty members, both within a department and among the various departments of a college or university, makes a fascinating study. To attempt to set up a list of categories which would identify individually all of the possible kinds of services and activities is an impossibility. The best that one can hope to do is to group into several major categories the kinds of services and activities that are performed by most of the faculty, and provide some device by which individuals with unusual or distinctive tasks may describe them in enough detail that they can be properly classified, either separately or in other categories, by the researchers.

A minor but important detail is the method of producing the forms. If at all possible, the forms should be printed, and in triplicate. The use of printed forms conveys the impression that the study is important and worth doing well. With extra forms, each faculty member may keep a copy of his report, and one may be kept by his dean or department head.

• *What supplemental information should be collected?* In some institutions, not only is little known about the actual activities of the faculty members, but no attempt has ever been made to analyze systematically the characteristics of the faculty. For this reason, some faculty load studies have gathered detailed information about the educational history of each faculty member, including such things as his degrees or diplomas, the names and locations of institutions attended, and his years of attendance. Some have also solicited information concerning types and amounts of work experience, including other kinds of teaching or administrative experience, and experience outside of the academic circle.[4] Other information that is sometimes requested includes the age of the respondent, the year in which he joined the staff, the number and dates of his promotions, awards or honors received during the year studied, editorships, books and journal articles published, or special honorary memberships or offices held during the year of study.

Such information should ordinarily be in the central files, however.

[4] Robert J. Keller, A. L. Pugsley, and Nathaniel Evers, *Comprehensive Educational Survey of Kansas*, Vol. III: *The Higher Education Study* (Topeka, Kan.: Kansas Legislative Council, March 1960). See pp. 39–49 for a reproduction of the report form used to gather data for this study; discussion of the form follows later in this chapter.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If it is available from any central source, the questionnaire form should not be used to obtain it.

• *How should the staff member report his work load?* One of the big problems in a faculty load study is how the faculty member should be asked to report his work load. One approach is to ask him to report the number of hours spent per week, on the average, on each of several specified activities. Some researchers have felt that a week is too short a period for good estimation, however, and have asked the individuals to estimate the number of hours spent per quarter or per semester upon each of the various activities. These estimates then may be divided by 12 or 18 weeks to derive a weekly work load from the quarter or semester report, respectively.

The major disadvantage of either of these techniques is that the sum of the parts sometimes exceeds the whole, and faculty members tend to arrive at a total work week that is rather high in hours. For example, in one study weekly work loads ranged as high as 120 hours when the individuals were asked to report in terms of hours spent per quarter.[5] A second disadvantage is that hourly allocations of time are very difficult to compile, unless a person's program is quite stable from week to week. Third, such data must be converted, individual by individual, to percentages if percentage comparisons are desired or if the data are to be used for a cost analysis.

A third method avoids the difficulty that a faculty member may have in specifying a certain number of hours of time spent on a particular activity, by asking him to report his work load in terms of the percentage of his total time that he has spent on each of the several activities. In other words, a full-time faculty member is considered to spend 100 percent of his time on activities related to his job appointment; he is asked to estimate, for a particular quarter or semester, what proportion of this 100 percent was spent on such things as instruction, departmental research, and other activities.

The main disadvantage of asking for a percentage analysis is that not all faculty members are using the same hours base in estimating their work loads. A second disadvantage is that no estimate can be

[5] Robert J. Keller and Margaret G. Abernathy, *The 1950–51 Survey of Faculty Activities at the University of Minnesota* (Minneapolis: Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, December 1951), 41 pp.

obtained of the average number of hours spent per week by faculty members in the different colleges, in different departments, or holding different ranks. It is disconcerting, too, for some faculty members to be asked to restrict themselves to 100 percent time in reporting their work loads; they feel that such a restriction does not permit them to report the fact that they work more than what they consider to be a full-time work load.

No one report technique can be said to be clearly superior to the other, although many people (including the author) believe that it is easier for faculty members to allocate their time on a percentage basis than to itemize the hours spent on various activities. Others believe that an hourly itemization is necessary to derive a percentage estimate. Because an administrator is interested in how much time a faculty member spends on his work as well as how he allocates his time, both kinds of information are desirable. The author suggests, therefore, that percentage allocations be requested for specific activities, and an hourly estimate be requested only for the staff member's total work week. The form should be set up in such a way as to discourage the hourly allocation of time among activities and the derivation of the total from these time fragments. The emphasis should be on the faculty member's conception of his total activity and how he divides his 100 percent time. The hourly average for the week can be used later by the respondent as a rough check, if he wishes.

The reader may question the accuracy of such estimates. Studies made by the author which compared percentage estimates with percentages computed from hourly reports found agreement almost always within 5 percent. Since it is likely that any method of estimating time spent will be in error at least 5 percent, the procedure suggested appears reasonable and relatively easy to follow. In another unpublished Minnesota study faculty hourly estimates were found to agree very favorably with diary records kept by a sample of the faculty during subsequent terms.

• *When should the forms be distributed?* Should the study be based on faculty activities during the current year, the past year, or the coming year? Should they be based on only one term or the whole year? Generally, it is a good idea to base the study on all three quarters or two semesters of a year in order to take into account unusual

changes in faculty functions from one term to another. Aside from providing an adequate picture of faculty activities, this procedure engenders faculty confidence in the study because it gives them the chance to describe their work with whatever variations occur from term to term.

It is most frustrating for a faculty member to be asked to estimate the amount or percentage of time "that he has spent" on activities during the current quarter or semester when the term has just begun. If the study is to request information on faculty activities for one semester or one quarter only, the report form should be distributed early the following quarter or semester, thus allowing the individual to report his estimate of what he actually did during the quarter or semester.

If the study is to be based on the entire academic year (the preferable practice), provisions should be made in the report form so that each faculty member can report the distribution of activities for each of the terms of the year, rather than attempt to estimate for the two or three terms combined. If at all possible, it is preferable to administer the form toward the end of the spring term, to minimize memory lapses, but generally end-of-year duties put a heavy drain on faculty time and energy which does not encourage cooperation in any study, much less one involving a questionnaire. For best faculty cooperation, it is preferable to collect all data at one time, and to request faculty load data for a given academic year early the following year.

Whatever the year selected as a basis for the study, many faculty will complain that it is not a typical year. The answer, of course, is that there is no such thing as a typical year—there is always something unusual or irregular about some aspect of an institution's program, staffing, student enrollment, or other phases that would affect one or more faculty member's work patterns. This is one of the underlying reasons why faculty load studies should not be "one-shot affairs."

Content of Faculty Activities Report

One of the first requirements of any questionnaire study is to set up a form that will be easily understood and easily answered. In a faculty load study it is necessary to define the various faculty activities care-

LIBRARY
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

fuffy, and state clearly just how the questions are to be answered. Some definitions of typical faculty activities found useful in faculty load studies are described below, with implications for their use in a report form.

• *Definitions of activities.* The major function of most college faculty members is instruction. Some faculty load studies seek only an over-all percentage allocation of time spent on actual classroom teaching. Some request that the percentage also include time spent on preparation, grading papers, counseling, and other aspects of instruction. Other studies ask for a breakdown of the instructional percentage among the various courses taught. Still other studies ask for a detailed allocation of time spent on each phase of the teaching job, for each course taught.

In the last case, for example, a professor might indicate that he spent 60 percent of his time during the first semester 1958–59 on instruction. He would then be asked to allocate the 60 percent among the three courses that he taught that particular semester, say 20 percent to each of three courses, and to allocate the 20 percent for each course among the time spent on preparation and reading for the respective course, the time actually spent in the classroom, the time spent on making up and grading examinations, the time spent on office hours for each class, or the time devoted to making up final grades. This example illustrates the point that was made earlier; that the degree of detail in a faculty load study must be carefully thought out by the researchers, because the more detail the longer the form will be, and the more difficult will be the task set for the individual faculty member.

A second major activity of the academic staff is research; but this activity is one of the most difficult to define. Research, for example, might be defined as systematic intensive study leading to the expansion of the body of knowledge or theory of the subject studied. (It would presumably *not* include reading and experimentation that were done primarily as preparation for teaching duties.) Such research might be basic research, applied research, or the development of processes, materials, or devices. Special attention must be given, however, to subject areas such as art, literature, and music, to determine whether the creative activities of individuals in those departments should be

considered comparable to the research conducted by other individuals. Another distinction that should be weighed is the difference between departmental and individual research conducted without outside support, and organized or sponsored research supported by special outside research funds or conducted within an organized research unit within the regular budget of the institution. It is usually desirable to differentiate these two types of research because faculty time spent on organized or sponsored research is not paid for by the institution, and does not constitute an institutional expense, unless the institution is contributing staff time, knowingly or unknowingly.

The demand upon college and university faculties for public and professional services is continually increasing. Public and professional services in one study were defined to reflect time spent in all activities carried on in the interest of public and professional groups; but services by the public information offices and agricultural extension division were classified separately.[6] The category included time involved in holding office in a public or professional organization, editing professional journals, or conducting business or educational surveys. It did not include, however, the time that the faculty member spent as the treasurer of a church, president of a service club, or other public activities that were not directly traceable to his professional competence in a particular field. Regular extension services, too, were excluded, but listed elsewhere. The Kansas study classified such activities simply as public services, subdivided into two categories—agricultural extension, and general extension and other services.[7]

With the current tight academic market, a study of the effective utilization of faculty might well want to distinguish between public and professional services provided without remuneration and those for which the faculty receive payment over and above their academic salaries. Because the problem of determining the extent to which faculty should be permitted to sell their professional services for extra pay is becoming increasingly acute, any faculty load study conducted in the future might well include a section which would attempt to get at the extent and variety of demand for such professional services,

[6] See p. 51 for the pertinent section of the report form of the California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study.

[7] See p. 44 for that section of the Kansas Higher Education Study form used to obtain data on public services.

over and above those traditionally performed without extra compensation. Certainly an institution needs to know the extent to which its faculty members are spending their time on consultantships or other activities for extra pay, in order to assess the effect of such activities upon the regular responsibilities of its staff.

Another major consumer of faculty time is student services. Examples of activities performed by faculty members in this category would be the registration of students, or assisting in the registrar's or the dean of student's office, or in the health service. In some institutions, each faculty member is expected to devote a certain proportion of his time to counseling a number of advisees assigned to him. In others, an organized student counseling center relieves the faculty of much of these duties. Both types of activities would be included in the category of student services. However, time spent in talking with students about course work taken from the faculty member would not be included; such tasks would be included under the time spent on instruction.

Faculty members frequently decry the amount of time that they devote to committee activities necessary to the operation and administration of a department or a college. In addition to committee work, departmental or general administration might also be defined to include time spent by departmental chairmen or deans on other kinds of administrative tasks, and time spent by faculty on special assignments such as staff recruiting, budget-making, and so forth. Time spent on departmental administration may or may not be separated from time spent on the administration of the college, or of the university, depending upon the amount of detailed information desired about this category.

Many institutions have units that are related to but are not a part of the instructional program of the institution. These units have been classified in some studies as "organized activities related to instruction." They have been categorized separately in order to separate the individuals and the amount of faculty time spent on such activities from the individuals and faculty time devoted to the regular college courses. Examples of such activities are laboratory schools, museums, dairy farms, and other special units.

Other classifications of faculty activities that might be listed on a faculty report form are those dealing with auxiliary services such as

(1) dormitories, food service, or health service; (2) athletic programs; or (3) library and library services. Each institution must determine for itself which of the above activities should be listed in order to provide information in the detail desired. However, in every case a blank category should be placed on the form in which the faculty member may list a particular activity that does not seem to fit any of the other categories listed. He should, of course, be asked to describe the activity briefly, to aid in the data analysis.

• *Allocation of time.* Two examples of forms used in faculty load studies during the past five years are shown in Figures 1 and 2. The form shown in Figure 1 was used in a state-wide study of higher education in Kansas and was designed for all types of institutions, both public and private.* The form shown in Figure 2 was used to obtain basic data essential to a cost analysis study involving several major universities. The first form contains many of the definitions and directions, whereas the second form was accompanied by a list of definitions and directions. With a list of activities such as that in section V of Figure 1, each individual can indicate on the report form how he distributed his time among the various categories; the total of his percentage breakdowns should equal the total time for his appointment. In other words, if he is a full-time staff member, the total of the percentages that he allocates among teaching, research, administration, and other services, should be 100 percent for each semester or each quarter. For those people who are on part-time appointments, the total of the percentage allocations among the various activities should equal the percentage of time of the appointment. Thus if a person is a half-time appointee, the 30 percent of his time that he might spend on teaching responsibilities plus the 20 percent that he might spend on student counseling each term should total his 50 percent appointment. If a full-time staff member was on leave the first semester, separate columns for each term makes it possible for him to indicate a total percentage of zero for the first semester, and allocate his 100 percent among his activities for the second semester.

To get a detailed analysis of the amount of time spent on the various types and levels of instruction, both report forms have special

*Section V and VI of the original Kansas form have been interchanged in Fig. 1 (pp. 44–49) to illustrate the method and sequence of reporting faculty time distribution recommended by the author.

grids in which the faculty member can list each course that he taught and the percentage time spent on it during each term. Included in these grids are spaces where the number of course credits, the type of instruction, the level of instruction, the number of students enrolled, the number of class hours per week that each course meets, and the number of sections of the class can be listed, either by the registrar's office (preferably) or by the individual faculty member. It is usually necessary to make some provision for courses by arrangement, and for thesis advisement in colleges where students do not register for a course dealing with thesis preparation. The most common practice is to concentrate on day-time regular course instruction only, at least in detail, because general extension and correspondence classes usually represent extra compensation for the faculty member. But in a study of the total work activity of a faculty, detailed data on general extension and correspondence classes might be collected in separate grids. It is better to have separate listings of these other types of classes to avoid confusion in the collection and interpretation of the information.

An illustration of the use of the form shown in Figure 1 in reporting work load might be helpful. Professor R, a full professo , filled out section V, dealing with total work load, as follows: Because he was on a full-time appointment, he marked 100 percent as his total percentage for each of the two semesters (see bottom of section V). During the first semester he spent 75 percent of his time on teaching, 5 percent on departmental research, 5 percent on departmental administration, 5 percent on general administrative duties, 5 percent on public services, and 5 percent on student services. During the second semester he was given responsibility for developing a new program in his department and his teaching load was reduced somewhat. Thus during the second semester he spent only 60 percent of his time on teaching, zero percent on departmental research, 25 percent on departmental administration, 5 percent on general administration, 5 percent on public services, and 5 percent for institutional services—for a total of 100 percent.

The figures entered by the registrar's office in columns "a" through "g" of the teaching load report (section VI of Figure 1), describe the course responsibilities of Professor R. He taught Chemistry 205, a 5-credit course with lectures offering 3 credits and 1 laboratory offer-

ing 2 credits, as shown by the codes of zero (for lecture) and 1 (laboratory) in column "e" (type of instruction). The course was open to any undergraduate (code 1, column "f") and the enrollment in both the lecture and laboratory sections (column "g") was 24 students. The other two courses taught by Professor R were Physical Chemistry 311, a lecture course, and 312, an optional laboratory course, each offered for 3 credits. These courses, however, were open only to upper division students, as is indicated by the code 2 under level of instruction. Eighteen students were enrolled in both the lecture and laboratory sections.

At the bottom of column "h" Professor R wrote 75 percent—his estimate of the proportion of his time spent on teaching the first semester. He then estimated that he had spent 20 percent of his time on the lecture part of chemistry 205 and 12 percent of his time on the laboratory part, considering all aspects of his teaching duties. He judged that he had spent 25 percent of his time on Chemistry 311 and 18 percent of his time on Chemistry 312. The sum of the percentages for the four courses was 75 percent, the over-all estimate derived in section V and listed at the bottom of column "h." The grid for the spring semester was filled out in similar fashion; but Professor R did not teach a physical chemistry laboratory course, and the proportion of his time devoted to instruction was only 60 percent.

Details about each of the courses taught can be entered by the faculty member, if necessity so dictates. However, experience suggests that data are more complete and exact if a central office, such as the registrar's office, fills in the course details for all faculty. This procedure also provides a means of checking whether a faculty member agrees with the registrar's office as to what and how many courses and students he is teaching.

Distribution and Collection of Forms

As suggested earlier, every device should be used which will encourage the full cooperation of the faculty, for without such cooperation data turned in may be incomplete or unreliable. Whether the study has been initiated by the administration or by a faculty committee, it is a good practice to accompany the forms with a letter of endorsement from the president, encouraging the faculty's whole-

hearted support. Some investigators have found it helpful to hold departmental or college meetings to set the stage for the study. The faculty report form may be circulated through the campus mail system, either under the supervision of an institutional research unit or the secretarial staff of some department or central administrative officer.

Practices vary as to whom the reports are to be returned. Sometimes the reports are to be returned directly to the president's office. Other times they are to be returned to the chairman of the faculty committee or to the unit responsible for institutional research. Because of rather typical faculty uneasiness about the use of materials returned directly to the president's office, the recommended practice is to have the forms returned to some other unit for analysis. Sometimes, but not always, the faculty member is told to keep one copy and a third copy is sent to the appropriate dean or division head.

An intermediate step in the collection of faculty load data is favored by some. Before the report forms are returned to the committee or other designated person for analysis, each set is routed through the dean or department head who has supervision over them. The dean or department head then reviews each of the reports in the light of his understanding and knowledge of the over-all operation of the department or unit he supervises. He compares the time allocations given on the forms by the various staff members and notes any glaring discrepancies. He may or may not change such discrepant figures. Not only does this procedure make it possible for one individual to view all reports from a given area with a single perspective, but it provides the additional direct benefit of requiring each administrator to sit down and determine how well his conception of how his faculty members spend their time agrees with the conceptions of the individual faculty members. Department heads who have participated in such a procedure have expressed genuine appreciation for the opportunity, and the experience has caused many to investigate discrepancies between their impression of what a faculty member was doing and the individual faculty member's report of what he was doing.

Generally at least two full weeks should be allowed for the faculty members to return their reports. After the two-week period has passed, each person who has not yet returned his form should be contacted by mail or by phone to encourage him to complete his report and return it as soon as possible. A third and even a fourth follow-up

may be necessary in certain situations. If incomplete reports are returned, every effort should be made to have the reluctant individuals fill out the forms completely. The success of a study of this type depends upon complete returns and complete reports.

Tabulation, Analysis, and Reporting of Results

The process of taking the returned forms, checking them for completeness, coding the answers, tabulating results, sorting, and classifying for special analyses requires a considerable amount of time. If an institutional research unit is available, it will assume these tasks. Without such a unit, tabulation and analyses will usually be done under the supervision of the committee or some person assigned to the task. Usually the kinds of information on the reports are considered confidential and use of student help should be judicious.

Tables 1 through 6 illustrate methods that can be used to report data obtained in faculty load studies and certain analyses of such data. Space does not permit detailed comment, but Table 1, for example, provides clues to the utilization of staff in offering various types and levels of instruction. The pattern of faculty functions is discernible in Table 2. Much speculation and concern can result from a careful scrutiny of tables similar to those shown.[9]

The kinds of tabulations will depend upon the scope of the study and the kinds of data collected. Some of the tabulations of information obtained from forms shown in Figures 1 and 2 could be made from course inventories; others could be made only after using such forms. Listed below are some of those tabulations that administrators and faculty usually find revealing and interesting:

1. A distribution of full-time equivalent staff devoted to each of the various activities;
2. A distribution showing the average percentages of time spent on the various academic functions, teaching, research, administration, etc., for each rank group and for all groups combined (see Tables 2 and 3);

(Text continued on page 31)

[9]For a more detailed discussion of the tables, see Stecklein, "Methods of Analyzing, Expressing, and Reporting Faculty Load Data," in *Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report*, ed. Kevin Bunnell (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960), pp. 26–35.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF MEAN PERCENTS OF TIME SPENT BY FACULTY MEMBERS ON TEACHING ACTIVITIES, BY TYPE AND LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION AND BY RANK, FOR THREE SELECTED COLLEGES, ACADEMIC YEAR 1954–55*

Type of Teaching	Level	Rank: Teaching Assistant		Instructor		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor		All Ranks	
		% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time	% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time	% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time	% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time	% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time	% of Full Time	% of Teaching Time
College A:													
All types	Lower	38.1	90.9	35.3	75.8	24.5	42.9	12.6	27.2	6.4	18.1	25.8	57.8
	Upper	3.2	7.6	7.3	15.7	20.5	35.9	18.1	39.0	12.8	36.2	10.6	23.8
	Graduate	0.6	1.5	4.0	8.5	12.1	21.2	15.7	33.8	16.2	45.7	8.2	18.4
Lecture and discussion	All levels	26.5	63.2	43.2	92.7	50.8	89.0	40.1	86.4	32.0	90.4	37.1	83.2
Laboratory	All levels	15.4	36.8	3.4	7.3	6.3	11.0	6.3	13.6	3.4	9.6	7.5	16.8
All types	All levels	41.9	100.0	46.6	100.0	57.1	100.0	46.4	100.0	35.4	100.0	44.6	100.0
College B:													
All types	Lower	27.5	65.8	42.4	61.3	26.0	44.1	16.6	29.2	9.1	23.6	25.0	49.0
	Upper	13.1	31.3	25.0	36.2	27.2	46.1	29.4	51.6	16.0	41.4	20.3	39.8
	Graduate	1.2	2.9	1.7	2.5	5.8	9.8	10.9	19.2	13.5	35.0	5.7	11.2
Lecture and discussion	All levels	10.4	24.9	37.2	53.8	34.1	57.8	39.7	69.8	30.4	78.8	27.1	53.1
Laboratory	All levels	31.4	75.1	31.9	46.2	24.9	42.2	17.2	30.2	8.2	21.2	23.9	46.9
All types	All levels	41.8	100.0	69.1	100.0	59.0	100.0	56.9	100.0	38.6	100.0	51.0	100.0
College C:													
All types	Lower	2.8	100.0	43.2	75.8	44.1	65.5	36.9	52.8	25.7	44.8	40.0	64.1
	Upper	0.0	0.0	13.8	24.2	23.2	34.5	33.0	47.2	30.4	53.0	22.3	35.7
	Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.2	0.1	0.2
Lecture and discussion	All levels	0.0	0.0	31.8	55.8	48.0	71.3	59.0	84.4	46.4	80.8	43.9	70.4
Laboratory	All levels	2.8	100.0	25.2	44.2	19.3	28.7	10.9	15.6	11.0	19.2	18.5	29.6
All types	All levels	2.8	100.0	57.0	100.0	67.3	100.0	69.9	100.0	57.4	100.0	62.4	100.0

* From John E. Stecklein, "Research on Faculty," in *College Self Study: Lectures on Institutional Research*, ed. Richard G. Axt and Hall T. Sprague (Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960), p. 82. Used by permission.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2: NUMBER AND PERCENT OF FULL-TIME ACADEMIC STAFF MEMBERS IN "COLLEGE A" DEVOTING SPECIFIED PROPORTIONS OF TIME TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS, BY RANK*

PERCENT OF TIME SPENT ON ACTIVITY, BY RANK	FUNCTION															
	Teaching		*Departmental Research*		*Organized and Sponsored Research*		*Total Research*		*Departmental Administration*		*General Administration*		*Public and Professional Services*		*Student Services*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professor:																
0%	2	2.4	21	25.0	76	90.5	15	17.8	14	16.7	50	59.5	12	14.3	42	50.0
1-5%	0	—	13	15.5	0	—	12	14.3	33	39.3	26	31.0	39	46.4	27	32.2
6-10%	3	3.6	14	16.7	0	—	13	15.5	10	11.9	5	5.9	23	27.4	8	9.5
11-20%	3	3.6	15	17.8	0	—	15	17.8	7	8.3	2	2.4	9	10.7	6	7.1
21-49%	31	36.9	17	20.2	5	5.9	22	26.3	13	15.5	0	—	1	1.2	0	—
50-79%	34	40.4	4	4.8	3	3.6	7	8.3	7	8.3	0	—	0	—	1	1.2
80-100%	11	13.1	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	1	1.2	0	—	0	—
Total	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0
Associate professor:																
0%	1	1.4	17	23.0	69	93.3	12	16.2	20	27.0	62	83.7	22	29.7	28	37.8
1-5%	0	—	16	21.6	0	—	16	21.6	31	41.9	10	13.5	36	48.7	28	37.8
6-10%	0	—	7	9.5	0	—	7	9.5	10	13.5	1	1.4	11	14.9	17	23.0
11-20%	0	—	17	23.0	0	—	17	23.0	6	8.1	1	1.4	5	6.7	0	—
21-49%	15	20.3	14	18.9	0	—	14	18.9	4	5.4	0	—	0	—	1	1.4
50-79%	37	50.0	3	4.0	5	6.7	8	10.8	3	4.1	0	—	0	—	0	—
80-100%	21	28.3	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
Total	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0	74	100.0
Assistant professor:																
0%	1	1.5	27	40.9	62	94.0	23	34.8	27	40.9	64	97.0	35	53.0	23	34.9
1-5%	0	—	3	4.6	0	—	3	4.6	20	30.3	2	3.0	23	34.9	24	36.4
6-10%	0	—	8	12.1	0	—	8	12.1	14	21.2	0	—	5	7.6	14	21.2
11-20%	0	—	11	16.7	1	1.5	12	18.2	2	3.0	0	—	3	4.5	4	6.0
21-49%	5	7.6	17	25.7	1	1.5	18	27.3	3	4.6	0	—	0	—	0	—
50-79%	34	51.5	0	—	2	3.0	2	3.0	0	—	0	—	0	—	1	1.5
80-100%	26	39.4	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
Total	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0

TABLE 2—*Continued*

Percent of Time Spent on Activity, by Rank	Function															
	Teaching		*Departmental Research*		*Organized and Sponsored Research*		*Total Research*		*Departmental Administration*		*General Administration*		*Public and Professional Services*		*Student Services*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Instructor:																
0%	0	—	40	71.4	54	96.4	38	67.8	40	71.4	53	94.6	35	62.5	26	46.4
1–5%	0	—	2	3.6	0	—	2	3.6	13	23.2	1	1.8	17	30.3	23	41.1
6–10%	1	1.8	4	7.1	0	—	4	7.1	2	3.6	1	1.8	3	5.4	5	8.9
11–20%	3	5.4	2	3.6	0	—	2	3.6	1	1.8	0	—	0	—	1	1.8
21–49%	9	16.1	8	14.3	0	—	8	14.3	0	—	0	—	1	1.8	1	1.8
50–79%	10	17.8	0	—	2	3.6	2	3.6	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
80–100%	33	58.9	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	1	1.8	0	—	0	—
Total	56	100.0	56	100.0	55	100.0	56	100.0	56	100.0	56	100.0	56	100.0	56	100.0
All Ranks:																
0%	4	1.4	105	37.5	261	93.2	88	31.4	101	36.1	229	81.8	104	37.2	119	42.6
1–5%	0	—	34	12.1	0	—	33	11.8	97	34.6	39	13.9	115	41.0	102	36.4
6–10%	4	1.4	33	11.8	0	—	32	11.4	36	12.8	7	2.5	42	15.0	44	15.7
11–20%	6	2.2	45	16.1	1	0.4	46	16.4	16	5.7	3	1.1	17	6.1	11	3.9
21–49%	60	21.4	56	20.0	6	2.1	62	22.2	20	7.2	0	—	2	0.7	2	0.7
50–79%	115	41.1	7	2.5	12	4.3	19	6.8	10	3.6	0	—	0	—	2	0.7
80–100%	91	32.5	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—	2	0.7	0	—	0	—
Total	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0	280	100.0

* Adapted from Stecklein, "Research on Faculty," in *College Self Study*, pp. 83–84. Used by permission.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3: PERCENTAGES OF FACULTY SPENDING SELECTED PROPORTIONS OF TIME ON TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICES IN THREE COLLEGES, BY RANK*

RANK	TEACHING 50 PERCENT OR MORE TIME			RESEARCH 5 PERCENT OR LESS TIME			PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES—MORE THAN 10 PERCENT TIME		
	College A	College C	College D	College A	College C	College D	College A	College C	College D
Professor	53.5	56.6	11.5	32.1	69.7	13.1	11.9	52.2	45.9
Associate professor	78.3	57.2	19.5	37.8	64.3	17.0	6.7	42.8	51.2
Assistant professor	90.0	54.6	31.0	39.4	63.7	40.4	4.5	27.3	26.2
Instructor	76.7	50.0	37.4	71.4	93.7	53.2	1.8	42.5	9.4
Total	73.6	54.7	22.7	43.2	73.5	27.8	6.8	36.0	35.8

* Adapted from Stecklein, "Research on Faculty," in *College Self Study*, p. 81. Used by permission.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4: PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN TEACHING ACTIVITIES PER CLOCK-HOUR OF INSTRUCTION IN "COLLEGE A," BY RANK AND LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION, FALL QUARTER, 1954

Level of Instruction	Teaching Activity Time per Clock Hour of Instruction				
	Professor (N = 109) (%)	Associate Professor (N = 94) (%)	Assistant Professor (N = 91) (%)	Instructor (N = 149) (%)	All Listed Ranks (N = 442) (%)
Lower division	6.48	5.12	5.90	7.75	6.65
Upper division	5.76	5.70	6.61	8.07	6.35
Graduate	7.17	7.92	9.01	9.10	7.89
All levels	6.53	5.96	6.61	7.89	6.81

TABLE 5: AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED BY FACULTY IN "COLLEGE A" TO SELECTED ACTIVITIES, BY RANK, 1950–51

Selected Activity	Average Number of Hours per Week				
	Professor (N = 76)	Associate Professor (N = 45)	Assistant Professor (N = 84)	Instructor (N = 143)	All Ranks (N = 338)
Research	6.29	7.46	7.56	5.03	6.27
Administrative responsibilities	3.75	1.23	1.12	0.93	1.65
Noncampus services	1.04	1.37	0.29	0.41	0.65
Total activities	54.92	54.73	53.87	48.93	51.93

3. A distribution of average number of hours worked per week, by rank, and by department or subject-field classification (see Table 5);
4. The full-time equivalent staff devoted to instruction of each type, at each level, and in each department or subject-matter classification. (NOTE: The full-time equivalent is determined by adding all of the percentages devoted to a particular level of instruction and dividing by 100, to arrive at the number of full-time persons who would have had to be employed to produce the same amount of instruction);
5. Ranges of class size and average class size taught at each level of instruction and by each academic rank;
6. The total number of credit hours offered each academic term, by level of instruction; by academic rank; by subject field;
7. A frequency distribution of the numbers of courses offered at each level of instruction and by rank groups;
8. A frequency distribution of types of instruction used in courses at each level;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6: PERCENT OF TIME SPENT PER INSTRUCTOR CLOCK-HOUR AND PER 10 STUDENT CLOCK-HOURS BY FACULTIES OF SELECTED DEPARTMENTS, BY RANK AND COURSE LEVEL, "COLLEGE A"

Rank and Course Level of Instruction	Psychology		Physics		Mathematics		History		English		Romance Languages	
	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours	% Per Clock Hour	% Per 10 Student Clock Hours
Professor:												
0–49	8.44	0.22	9.75	0.71	3.00	1.11	10.15	0.57	—	—	—	—
50–99	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.21	2.09	8.29	2.75	5.00	2.50
100–199	7.35	1.30	4.53	4.44	—	—	5.53	1.97	8.58	3.54	7.77	13.84
200+	6.67	4.76	4.96	8.84	5.83	4.32	4.29	7.32	12.29	14.52	7.00	29.00
Total	7.52	0.63	5.61	1.97	4.55	2.31	6.81	1.32	9.53	4.54	6.91	7.68
Associate professor:												
0–49	—	—	6.50	0.39	4.60	0.88	15.00	3.00	6.33	1.71	4.08	2.13
50–99	—	—	—	—	5.83	2.06	4.38	0.77	8.41	2.96	10.40	11.30
100–199	8.33	0.91	—	—	8.22	7.47	5.74	3.16	9.67	3.78	8.43	16.62
200+	8.00	4.60	1.70	5.67	6.44	10.18	—	—	11.00	7.86	6.60	22.00
Total	8.13	1.79	4.10	0.49	5.87	1.93	5.95	2.11	8.37	2.89	6.27	5.08
Assistant professor:												
0–49	3.75	1.10	8.86	0.97	7.57	0.98	5.00	0.23	11.82	3.71	—	—
50–99	—	—	11.00	0.50	—	—	8.33	0.61	9.89	2.24	6.67	6.06
100–199	2.13	0.90	9.22	4.54	7.14	2.60	3.50	3.18	12.85	9.94	11.00	15.71
200+	5.43	3.36	9.67	19.33	—	—	—	—	12.50	9.62	—	—
Total	3.68	1.60	9.33	1.46	7.43	1.23	5.78	0.40	11.36	3.73	8.11	8.39
Instructor:												
0–49	8.88	0.79	—	—	4.56	1.54	6.00	0.31	6.62	1.47	6.27	2.88
50–99	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.33	2.56	9.33	2.55	—	—
100–199	10.00	2.08	—	—	—	—	1.67	2.78	—	—	—	—
200+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	9.60	0.94	—	—	4.56	1.54	4.09	0.43	6.78	1.52	6.27	2.88
All ranks combined:												
0–49	8.03	0.43	8.34	0.66	5.55	1.06	8.86	0.50	6.93	1.59	5.51	2.64
50–99	—	—	11.00	0.50	5.83	2.06	7.01	1.44	9.08	2.55	7.18	5.26
100–199	6.84	1.30	7.37	4.52	7.57	3.60	5.41	2.31	10.11	4.69	8.40	15.27
200+	6.53	4.05	4.49	9.16	6.20	6.74	4.29	7.32	11.94	11.51	6.78	21.03
Total	7.16	0.81	6.82	1.30	6.00	1.56	6.33	1.16	8.12	2.21	6.52	4.37

9. If data are available, distributions showing detailed analysis of full-time equivalent staff devoted to certain services included in each major category;
10. If desired, certain unit measures can be computed and tabulated which will show such things as the average percentage of time spent (by each academic rank, by subject-field classification, and by department) per credit hour, per student credit hour, per class hour, or per student class hour of instruction.

The last tabulation represents a more detailed analysis of the data than is usually made, but provides new insight into the relationship between percentage of time spent on courses and the credit hours or student credit hours involved (see Tables 4 and 6).

If data have been collected concerning correspondence, evening, or extension course work, tabulations should also include the number and type of courses offered, by subject fields and by faculty rank groups, the number of students involved, the level of instruction, and ranges and averages of numbers of hours spent on such instruction. If detailed descriptions of service activities have been obtained, the kinds of services should be summarized, possibly with number of occurrences or full-time equivalent staff devoted to each. Such summaries can be developed for the regular professional activities as well as for those which are carried on for extra compensation.

The tabulations and analyses listed above are not intended to be all-inclusive; they merely suggest the more common types of analyses and tabulations that result from a faculty load study. Other analyses may well be more appropriate for a particular institution's purposes.

It is a good practice to make available to every study participant a copy of the results of the study. The final report presumably would not identify any individual and might consist of sets of summary tabulations for those persons who wanted to study the findings in detail, or a condensed interpretive summary of the findings for those individuals who would not care to read statistical tables. Deans sometimes request tables of all basic data for all units in the study so that they may make analyses and comparisons of their own.

Generally the results of such studies are considered confidential and are restricted to distribution within the institution. This is one reason why so few are found in published form. Increased exchange

of faculty load data should be encouraged, however, because the more that is known about how competing and noncompeting institutions operate, the greater will be the strides toward increased effectiveness and efficient operation of our colleges and universities.

4. Uses of Faculty Load Data

MOST FACULTY LOAD STUDIES ARE INITIATED BY SOME MEMBER OF the administration, with some administrative use contemplated. Administrators find faculty load data useful in many ways, including the following: in identifying inequities in faculty load; in obtaining guide lines for the assignment of faculty loads to new staff members; in learning what activities, other than instruction, consume large amounts of faculty time; indirectly, in recommending promotions or salary increases; or in deciding whether to support or reject requests for increases in staff or increases in curriculum offerings.

Faculty load data can be very useful, but they can also easily be misused. One's first inclination is to use them to set up a standard work load for all faculty. Such standard loads are already in existence. But differences in faculty loads can easily be justified. Not all faculty members should be expected to spend the same proportions of time on the basic faculty functions. In the opinion of the author, no attempt should be made to standardize the work load either in terms of number of course credits taught or in terms of a standard number of hours in the workweek. Many persons define academic freedom to include the opportunity for a college staff member to work as little or as much as he wishes and to serve as many functions as he wishes. In counterbalance, however, administrators who support this definition must temper such idealism with budgetary realism. Although they may do everything possible to develop a liberal academic atmosphere, they must be alert and responsible for minimum activity that represents a drain on the financial resources of the institution, and results in an overload for other staff members.

One method of meeting this apparent dilemma is to gather and use average work load data, obtained periodically for each department or

each college, as a topic of discussion between faculty and administrators. Consideration could be given to whether faculty emphasis, in terms of average staff time spent, is consistent with the stated purposes of the institution or department. For example, if a departmental or college faculty decide that its resources should be devoted one-half to instruction, and one-sixth each to research, public services, and student services, these over-all proportions of faculty time may be maintained approximately (until change seems warranted) without setting them as a standard load for every faculty member. The departmental functional goals can be met by balance rather than uniformity. Professor B, who is particularly capable and interested in providing services to community organizations may, with departmental approval, concentrate all of his efforts on public service and instruction. Assistant Professor C may concentrate on only instruction and research. Still others may distribute their time among the three basic functions while some spend time on still additional functions that must be served by the department or college. Most institutions are currently being operated on a semi-intuitive basis, because no faculty load data are being collected periodically to determine how well the balance is being maintained and what staff adjustments, if any, are necessary.

Much additional probing is needed into differences in the amounts of time needed to teach courses at the different levels, differences in the amounts of time spent on instruction by the different rank groups, and variations in amounts of time spent on courses at the same level in different subject fields, and amounts of time spent on different modes of instruction. Further study is needed concerning the effect upon the amount of time spent by an instructor when he teaches more than one section of a particular course. More information is needed also on the extent of committee work since many faculty members consider this a heavy drain on their time. Ways should be studied to improve the efficiency of faculty participation in the operation and policy-making of an institution. Accurate measures are needed to evaluate better the time spent on research and professional activities. More faculty load data can be helpful in looking critically at the traditional 1½ or 2 to 1 relationship that is frequently used in assigning laboratory courses *vs.* lecture courses, or upper division courses *vs.* lower division courses.

It is a plain fact that not nearly enough is known about how faculty

persons operate, how they decide how to spend their time, what priorities are given to certain activities over others, and the extent to which faculty members have a true conception of the functions of the institution and the way in which their activities fit together with the official statements of function. The more faculty load studies are made and the more results of such studies are disseminated and shared with other institutions, the better will be the understanding of how the college faculty member operates and serves his institution.

Such studies should not be "one-shot affairs"; they should be repeated periodically, probably not as often as annually, but at least every three to five years. It is unlikely that any extensive administrative decisions can be made affecting faculty utilization based on a single year's study of faculty load. However, with information on faculty services and activities available from three or four studies conducted over a decade, an administrator should have ample information upon which to support recommendations for changes in load assignments, changes in functions of the institution, establishment of principles concerning outside activities for extra compensation, and many other phases of faculty endeavor.

Fig. 1.—Form Used To Obtain Faculty Data in Kansas Study of Higher Education

COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL SURVEY OF KANSAS
HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY

WHITE—Original for Higher Educ. Study

CANARY—Duplicate Copy for Institution

PINK—Triplicate Copy for Staff Member

SCHEDULE VI
FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS STUDY FORM

(Issued 3-24-59)

The purpose of this schedule is to secure information about faculty members in all Kansas colleges and universities. This includes background information about educational preparation, prior experience, initial and current appointments at the present institution, and nature of the work load. This information will be useful in projecting faculty needs.

This schedule should be completed by or for all faculty members employed on a full- or part-time appointment in a Kansas college during the 1958-1959 academic year. This will include student assistants, instructors, all professorial ranks and administrative personnel who hold a formal appointment on the faculty. Civil service employees, summer appointments only, and staff paid on a miscellaneous hourly basis should be excluded.

Identification of faculty members by name is optional. Only the identification numbers assigned by the Institutional Representative will be used and these only to insure complete coverage of faculty. Please complete each item, indicating "none" or "no information" when this is an appropriate response. Items are numbered in parentheses to facilitate punch card analysis. There are six parts to Schedule VI.

PART I. IDENTIFICATION

(1-2) Institution_____ (3-5) Faculty Name or Number_____

(6-8) College or School (if any)_____ Department_____

(9-12) Teaching Field or Fields_____

(13) Sex: 1. Male_____ 2. Female_____ (Check √ One) (14-5) Date of Birth_____ (Month) (Day) (Year)

Fig. 1—Continued

PART II. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Please record below your educational preparation, beginning with high school and continuing through graduate or professional study. Include honorary degrees on last line. (Note: The first line has been completed as shown in *parentheses* to illustrate undergraduate education.)

Code Space (Leave Blank)	Level	Name and Location of Institution	Years of Attendance	Degree or Diploma	Date Awarded
(Illustration)	*Undergraduate*	*Washburn University, Topeka, Kan.*	*1940–'42*	*None*	*None*
		University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	*1945–'47*	*B. A.*	*1947*
(16)	High School				
(17–20)	Undergraduate				
(21–2)	Graduate				
(23–5)	Advanced Professional				
(26)	Honorary Degrees				

PART III. EXPERIENCE RECORD

A. Please summarize below the amount of experience which you have had apart from your present college position, using the classification provided.

Amount of Experience (Number of Years)	Type of Experience
(27) _____	*a.* Teaching or administrative experience at the elementary or secondary school level in public or private schools.
(28) _____	*b.* College experience in teaching, research, administration, or related academic staff position.
(29) _____	*c.* Related professional experience outside educational institution but after completion of college work.
(30) _____	*d.* Other outside work experience including military service (unless included in *c* above) and beginning after completion of college program.

B. (31) What was your position or status immediately prior to your first appointment in your present college? Check (√) below:

_____ 1. Undergraduate student.

_____ 2. Graduate student (Including possible assistantship).

_____ 3. Academic position in college or university at instructor or assistant professor level.

_____ 4. Academic position in college or university at associate or full professor level.

_____ 5. Military service.

_____ 6. Related professional position outside college or university.

_____ 7. Unrelated employment (Defined in *d* of previous item).

_____ 8. Unemployed.

_____ 9. Other status. Specify: _____

Fig. 1—Continued

PART IV. EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT INSTITUTION

A. FIRST AND PRESENT APPOINTMENTS.

Two kinds of information are sought below. In Column I record information concerning your first academic appointment in your present college. In Column II record similar information for your present appointment. Please complete both columns if you have had a change in rank, salary, duties, etc. Complete only Column I if your first and present appointments are the same.

Position Characteristics and Code	Column I First Appointment	Column II Present Appointment
Note: Use codes shown below whenever possible. Otherwise write in response.		
ACADEMIC RANK		
Code 0. No academic rank 1. Professor 2. Associate Professor 3. Assistant Professor 4. Instructor 5. Teaching or Research Assistant (Undergraduate) 6. Teaching or Research Assistant (Graduate) 7. Visiting faculty status 8. Retired or emeritus status	(32)	(33)
TENURE STATUS		
Code 0. None, temporary position or appointment 1. Pre-tenure status 2. Tenure or permanent status	(34)	(35)
TIME OF APPOINTMENT Month and year in which first appointment (I) or present rank (II) became effective (e. g., 9-47).	(36-7) Mo. Yr.	(38-9) Mo. Yr.
OTHER TITLES Indicate position designation as follows:		
Code 1. Chief administrative officer 2. Other general administrators 3. Dean or head of major division 4. Department head or director 5. Other position. (Specify_____)	(40)	(41)

BASIS OF APPOINTMENT Indicate length of base appointment, percentage of time and salary for this appointment.

Length of Appointment:

Code

1. Less than 9 months.
2. 9-10 months.
3. 11-12 months.
4. Other. (Specify_____)

_____ (42) _____ (43)

Percentage of Time: Record the percentage of time allocated officially to your appointment. A half-time appointment would be recorded as 50% for the length of appointment shown above.

_____% (44-5) _____% (46-7)

Salary: Indicate the amount of money (to be) received over the course of this appointment and for the percentage of time indicated above.

$_____ (48-50) $_____ (51-3)

B. OTHER PAID RESPONSIBILITIES ADDITIONAL TO PRESENT POSITION.

Please describe below any other institutional responsibilities which you carry at your institution **in addition to your regular appointment** and for which you receive **extra reimbursement.**

Summer Session Appointment

Did you teach during the 1958 summer session or sessions? ____Yes ____No. (54) If yes, complete below:

Number of weeks____ (54) Number of courses taught____ (55) Number of Semester Class Credit Hours taught____ (56-7)

Total student credit hours_____ (58-9) Salary for Summer Session Appointment_____ (60-1) Indicate Basis of Appointment (e. g., half-time for 8 weeks)_____(62)

Extension or Evening Class Appointment (June 1, 1958-May 31, 1959)

Have you taught or are you now teaching as an extra assignment any extension or evening college courses during this period? ____Yes No_____ (63) If yes, complete below:

Number of courses taught_____ (63). Number of Semester Class Credit Hours taught_____ (64-5). Total student credit hours _____ (66-7). Total additional salary_____ (68-9)

Correspondence Appointment (June 1, 1958-May 31, 1959)

Have you taught or are you now teaching any correspondence courses? _____Yes _____No. (70) If yes, complete below:

Number of courses taught_____ (70) Total student credit hours completed_____ (71-2) Total students enrolled_____ (73-4)

Total additional salary_____ (75-6)

Other Additional Responsibilities at Your Institution. Please describe briefly below and indicate additional compensation. (77-9)_____

Fig. 1—Continued

PART V. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WORK LOAD

Please indicate below in the spaces provided the percent of time devoted to various instructional and other institutional responsibilities that are part of your regular base appointment. Exclude all additional responsibilities for which extra compensation is received.

Description of Service	Percent of Full Time Assignment	
	1st Semester 1958-59	2nd Semester 1958-59
	(II)	(III)
TEACHING Include the responsibilities listed in Part V (the sum of the percentages) and any other faculty services associated with instruction such as student counseling and guidance. (Exclude teaching for additional reimbursement.)	75 % (37-8)	60 % (37-8)
RESEARCH		
(a) Departmental or non-sponsored research	5 % (39-40)	0 % (39-40)
(b) Organized or sponsored research supported by special research funds	% (41-2)	% (41-2)
ADMINISTRATION		
(a) Departmental administration	5 % (43-4)	25 % (43-4)
(b) General or institutional administration	5 % (45-6)	5 % (45-6)
(c) Physical plant (Planning, scheduling, etc.)	% (47-8)	% (47-8)
PUBLIC SERVICES		
(a) Agricultural extension	% (49-50)	% (49-50)
(b) General extension and other public services	5 % (51-2)	5 % (51-2)

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

(*a*) Student services including organized student personnel work, recruitment, scholarship activities, student activity advising, etc. Auxiliary services	5 % (53-4)	5 % (53-4)
(*b*) Housing, dormitories, food service, union, health service	% (55-6)	% (55-6)
(*c*) Athletics	% (57-8)	% (57-8)
(*d*) Library services	% (59-60)	% (59-60)
TOTAL PERCENTAGE	100 % (61-2)	100 % (61-2)

(Total Percentage is 100% for Full-time Service per Semester on a base appointment. For part-time appointments the sum of the percentages should equal the percentage of time indicated on base appointment.)

Fig. 1—Continued

PART VI. TEACHING LOAD REPORT

Record below the courses taught by the individual faculty member as part of the regular instructional load on the base appointment reported in Part IV, A. Exclude extension or other courses for which extra reimbursement is made. Follow instructions shown below the table for the separate columns. Report separately for courses which require two or more kinds of instruction to divide credits and enrollments as in the case of separate lecture and laboratory sections shown in the illustration.

Please provide the same kind of information for both fall semester, 1958, and spring semester, 1959. The first entry has been completed for illustrative purposes. See notes for columns (*a*) through (*h*).

FALL SEMESTER, 1958-1959

(II-21) Department (a)	Course Number (b)	Semester Class Credit Hours For Course (c)	Semester Class Credit Hours For This Section or Part You Teach (d)	Type of Instruction (e)	Level of Instruction (f)	Number of Students Enrolled in Class (g)	Percent of Your Full-time Appointment (h)
(22-4) *Illustration: Chemistry*	(25-7) *205*	(28) *5*	(29) *3*	(30) *0*	(31) *1*	(32-4) *24*	(35-6) *20%*
"	*205*	*5*	*2*	*1*	*1*	*24*	*12%*
(1)	311	3	3	0	2	18	25%
(2)	315	3	3	1	2	18	18%
(3)							
(4)							

(5)							
(6)							
(7)							
(8)							
(9)							
(0)							
(X)							
(Y)							

Total Instructional Percentage 75 %

See "Notes by Columns" on page 49 for instructions for filling in Part VI.

Fig. 1—Continued

SPRING SEMESTER, 1958-1959

(III-21) Department (a) (22-4)	Course Number (b)	Semester Class Credit Hours For Course (c)	Semester Class Credit Hours For This Section or Part You Teach (d)	Type of Instruction (e)	Level of Instruction (f)	Number of Students Enrolled in Class (g)	Percent of Your Full-time Appointment (h)
(1)	(25-7) 206	(28) 5	(29) 3	(30) 0	(31) 1	(32-4) 22	(35-6) 20%
(2)	206	5	2	1	1	22	15%
(3)	312	3	3	0	2	17	25%
(4)							
(5)							
(6)							
(7)							
(8)							
(9)							
(0)							
(X)							
(Y)							

Total Instructional Percentage 60%

Notes by Columns:

(*a*) Indicate the Department, or if no department designation is available, the field in which the course is given.

(*b*) Indicate the Catalogue number of the course.

(*c*) Indicate the Semester Class Credit Hours shown in the Catalogue listing. If the course is for zero credit, but is regularly scheduled, indicate the equivalent semester class credit hours in parentheses. Example: Remedial English.

(*d*) Indicate the Semester Class Credit Hours taught by this teacher in this class. Sometimes a teacher will be responsible only for a portion of the catalogue credit hours listed. For example, he may teach two semester credit hours as lecturer for a four semester credit hour course with the balance of the work being taught in smaller sections by others who should be credited with teaching two semester credit hours each.

When more than one type of instruction is reported, be sure to allocate the number of credits to the appropriate type of instruction, e. g., a 5 credit beginning physics course in which 3 hours per week are spent in lecture (or lecture and discussion) and 4 hours in laboratory work would assign 3 credits to lecture (or lecture and discussion) and 2 credits to laboratory instruction.

(*e*) Please use the following code to indicate type of instruction.

0. Chiefly lecture and/or discussion.
1. Laboratory.
2. Independent study, research, special problems or individual lessons.
3. Other (please explain_____).

(*f*) Please use the following code to indicate level of instruction.

0. Available primarily for lower division students (freshmen and/or sophomores).
1. Open to undergraduates of all levels without restriction.
2. Open only to upper division students (juniors, seniors and/or 5th year undergraduates).
3. Open only to upper division and graduate students.
4. Open only to graduate students.
5. Other (please explain_____).

(*g*) When reporting the number of students in the class do so as of the close of the second week of the semester. Include only those who are responsible to you for the credit hours taught. Exclude auditors.

(*h*) Please record the percentage of time devoted to each class or section. The percentage should approximate the proportion of over-all professional responsibilities which you devote to this class.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fig. 2.—Form Used To Obtain Faculty Data in California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study

CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN CONFERENCE COST AND STATISTICAL STUDY **FORM L-2: INDIVIDUAL WORK ANALYSIS, 1954-1955**

INSTITUTION: _____ CAMPUS _____ INDIVIDUAL'S NAME _____ RANK _____

COLLEGE OR SCHOOL: _____ DEPARTMENT _____ ADMINISTRATOR'S SIGNATURE _____

A. TEACHING WORK ANALYSIS

FIRST SEMESTER OR FALL QUARTER							SECOND SEMESTER OR WINTER QUARTER							SPRING QUARTER						
DEPT.	COURSE NUMBER	TYPE OF INSTR	SECTIONS	NO. OF STUDENTS	LEVEL OF INSTR	% OF FULL-TIME	DEPT.	COURSE NUMBER	TYPE OF INSTR	SECTIONS	NO. OF STUDENTS	LEVEL OF INSTR	% OF FULL-TIME	DEPT.	COURSE NUMBER	TYPE OF INSTR	SECTIONS	NO. OF STUDENTS	LEVEL OF INSTR	% OF FULL-TIME
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TEACHING TIME SUB-TOTAL							TEACHING TIME SUB-TOTAL							TEACHING TIME SUB-TOTAL						

B. NON-TEACHING WORK ANALYSIS

LINE NO.	DESCRIPTION	SUBJECT FIELD, SERVICE, OR RELATED ACCOUNT IN WHICH THE WORK WAS PERFORMED		PERCENTAGE OF FULL-TIME		
		CODE NUMBER	STANDARD ABBREVIATION	1ST SEM. OR FALL QTR.	2ND SEM. OR WINTER QTR.	SPRING QUARTER
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	TEACHING TIME SUB TOTAL					
2	DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH					
3	DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION					
4	PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	7 6 0 0	PROF. SERV.			
5	ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES RELATED TO INSTRUCTIONAL DEPTS.	7 3				
6	Organized & Sponsored Research	7 4				
7	LIBRARY	7 5 0 0	LIBRARY			
8	PUBLIC SERVICE & INFORMATION	7 6				
9	EXTENSION	7 7 0 0	EXTENSION			
10	AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION	7 8 0 0	AG. EXTENSION			
11	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	8 1				
12	STUDENT SERVICES	8 2				
13	STAFF BENEFITS	8 3				
14	Gen. Institutional Services & Expense	8 4				
15	Physical Plant Operation & Maint.	8 5				
16	AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	8 6 0 0	AUX. ENTER.			
17	STUDENT AID	8 7 0 0	STUDENT AID			
18						
19						
20	TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF FULL-TIME					

C. ACTUAL SALARY EXPENDITURES

LINE NO.	STANDARD CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT FIELDS, SERVICES, AND RELATED ACCOUNTS		SALARY EXPENDITURES		
	TITLE	CODE	ACAD. YEAR	SUMMER	TOTAL
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENTS				
2	(a)				
3	(b)				
4	(c)				
5	ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES RELATED TO INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENTS	7 3			
6	ORGANIZED & SPONSORED RESEARCH	7 4			
7	LIBRARY	7 5 0 0			
8	PUBLIC SERVICE & INFORMATION	7 6			
9	AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION	7 8 0 0			
10	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	8 1			
11	STUDENT SERVICES	8 2			
12	STAFF BENEFITS	8 3			
13	Gen. Institutional Services & Expense	8 4			
14	PHYSICAL PLANT OPERATION & MAINT.	8 5			
15	AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	8 6 0 0			
16	STUDENT AID	8 7 0 0			
17					
18					
19	TOTAL INSTITUTION SALARY				

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

ARTHUR S. ADAMS, *President*

The American Council on Education is a *council* of national associations; organizations having related interests; approved universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, technological schools, and selected private secondary schools; state departments of education; city school systems and private school systems; selected educational departments of business and industrial companies; voluntary associations of higher education in the states; and large public libraries. It is a center of cooperation and coordination whose influence has been apparent in the shaping of American educational policies and the formation of educational practices during the past forty-three years.